SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

the civil docket sheet. (SEE II	NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS	DEFENDANTS		
JEAN SCHRADER		NCO FINANCIA	NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.		
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff	County of Residence of	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	me, Address, Telephone Number and Email Ad	iress) NOTE: IN LAN	D CONDEMNATION CASES, US	SE THE LOCATION OF THE	
Craig Thor Kimmel, E. Kimmel & Silverman, 30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002 (215) 540-8888 II. BASIS OF JURISE	P.C.		INVOLVED.		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☑ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		TF DEF 1		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) 	Citizen of Another State	2 🗇 2 Incorporated and F of Business In A		
N/ NAMUDE OF CHI	T	Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 Foreign Nation		
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vchicle Product Liability 350 Motor Vchicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 368 Asbestos Person Injury Product Liability 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damag Product Liability 385 Property Damag Product Liability 385 Property Damag Product Liability 368 Asbestos Person Injury Product Iability 371 Truth in Lending 385 Property Damag Product Liability 385 Property Damag Souther Personal Injury 385 Property Damag Product Liability 385 Property Damag Product Liability 385 Property Damag Product Liability 385 Property Damag Souther Personal Injury 385 Property Damag Product Liability 385 Property Damag Souther Personal Injury 385 Property Damag Product Liability 385 Property Damag Souther Personal Injury 385 Property Damag Product Liability 385 Property Damag Souther Personal Souther Personal Injury 385 Property Damag Product Liability 385 Property Damag Souther Personal Injury 385 Property Damag Souther Personal	- G20 Other Food & Drug	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ■ 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
第1 Original □ 2 Re	ate Court Appellate Court		ferred from		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON Brief description of cause: Fair Debt Collection Practices A				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	N DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
12 30 II	SIGNATURE O	AIGTHOR KIN	nmer		

Case 2:11-cv-079 STATES PISTRIC TEGQUES 5/11 Page 2 of 11

Address of Plaintiff: 3101 SW Watson Court, Port St	LVC18, FL 39933
Address of Plaintiff: 3101 SW Watson Court, Port St Address of Defendant: 507 Prudential Read, Horsham	, PA 19044
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:	
(Use Reverse Side For A	
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation a	
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)	Yes No.
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes No
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one ye	ar previously terminated action in this court?
	Yes□ No 🗗
. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior staction in this court?	ait pending or within one year previously terminated
	Yes□ No 🗹
. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier n	res
terminated action in this court?	Yes No
Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights	
and case a second of successive hardes corpus, social security appear, or pro-sectivit rights	Yes No
	Yes L No L
IVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) . Federal Question Cases:	P. Divaraita Luis Jistin Con
. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
. □ FELA	2. ☐ Airplane Personal Injury
. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation
. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury
5. 🗆 Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
5. Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Plea
	specify)
. □ Civil Rights	7. □ Products Liability
. □ Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos
. Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases
Social Security Review Cases	•
1. All other Federal Question Cases ISUSC \$1697	(Please specify)
(Please specify)	
ARBITRATION CERTIF	
(Check Appropriate Cate	
☐ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and be	lief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum
50,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; ☐ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	
ATE: 12/30/11 /S/CMIGTHOR KIME	mi 57100
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there	has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
ertify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or wicept as noted above.	thin one year previously terminated action in this court
ATE: 12/30/11 /S/CM19Thorkim	nol 57100
	1101

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Jean Schneder		: CIVIL ACTION				
v.		:				
NCO Financial Sy.	stems, Inc.	:	NO.			
plaintiff shall complete a Ca filing the complaint and serv side of this form.) In the designation, that defendant	ase Management Tree a copy on all defe event that a defend shall, with its first rties, a Case Mana	rack Designation andants. (See § 1 lant does not agappearance, subgement Track D	action Plan of this court, couns a Form in all civil cases at the tien of the plan set forth on the regree with the plaintiff regarding mit to the clerk of court and ser designation Form specifying the	me of everse g said eve on		
SELECT ONE OF THE FO	OLLOWING CAS	SE MANAGEM	IENT TRACKS:			
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.						
(b) Social Security – Cases and Human Services der	requesting review or a string plaintiff Soci	of a decision of al Security Bend	the Secretary of Health efits.	()		
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.						
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.						
(e) Special Management – Commonly referred to as the court. (See reverse s	complex and that	need special or i	intense management by			
management cases.)						
(f) Standard Management –	Cases that do not t	fall into any one	of the other tracks.	()		
12/30/11 Date	Craig Thor Attorney-at-	Simme	Jean Schvader Attorney for			
216-540-8884	877-788-8	2864	Kimmel@ creditlaw	.com		
Telephone	FAX Numbe	er	E-Mail Address			

(Civ. 660) 10/02

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 3 4 JEAN SCHRADER, 5 Plaintiff 6 Case No.: v. 7 8 NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., **COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 9 Defendant (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 10 11 **COMPLAINT** 12 JEAN SCHRADER ("Plaintiff"), by and through her attorneys, KIMMEL & 13 14 SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, 15 INC., ("Defendant"): 16 INTRODUCTION 17 1. Count I of Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection 18 19 Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seg. (FDCPA). 20 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE** 21 Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), 2. 22 which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate 23 24 United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 25

U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.

- 3. Defendant conducts business and has an office in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.
 - 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Port St. Lucie, Florida 34953.
- 6. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 7. Also, Plaintiff is a person granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a) and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2000).
- 8. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, Pennsylvania, 19044-2308.
- 9. Defendant is a debt collector as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and sought to collect a consumer debt from Plaintiff.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 11. At all pertinent times hereto, Defendant was hired to collect a consumer debt and attempted to collect that debt from Plaintiff.
- 12. The alleged debt at issue arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 13. Beginning in or around November 2011, and continuing through December 2011, Defendant constantly and continuously placed collection calls to Plaintiff on her home telephone seeking and demanding payment for an alleged debt.
- 14. Plaintiff received collection calls from the following numbers: (800) 477-1827 and (877) 273-3495, which the undersigned has confirmed are telephone numbers belonging to Defendant.
- 15. Defendant contacted Plaintiff, on average, one to two times a day in its attempts to collect a debt.
- 16. In its telephone calls to Plaintiff, Defendant failed to disclose the amount of the debt, to whom the debt was owed, or why it was contacting her.
- 17. Further, Defendant left pre-recorded messages on her home answering machine requesting a call back, but it did not disclose the name of the individual it was seeking to contact.

- 18. Most recently, Defendant contacted Plaintiff twice on December 15, 2011.
 - 19. Plaintiff is an eighty-seven year old woman.
- 20. It was inconvenient for her to receive debt collection calls on her home telephone.
- 21. Defendant's sole purpose in contacting Plaintiff continuously and repeatedly on her home telephone was to harass and annoy her.
 - 22. Plaintiff disputes owing the debt.
- 23. Upon information and belief, Defendant failed to send Plaintiff written notification informing her of her rights to dispute the debt and/or request verification of the debt.
- 24. Defendant conducted its debt collection activities in ways that were factually misrepresented and in violation of the FDCPA.

CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

25. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." Russell v. Equifax A.R.S., 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp., 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding

unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); Clomon v. Jackson, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).

- 26. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 *et seq.*, is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).
- 27. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for

bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. <u>Clomon</u>, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 28. Defendant violated the FDCPA based on the following:
 - a. Defendant violated §1692 generally;
 - b. Defendant violated §1692b(3) of the FDCPA when it communicated with Plaintiff more than once about another person's debt;
 - c. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(1) of the FDCPA when it communicated with Plaintiff at a time or place that it knew or should have known was inconvenient;
 - d. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPΛ by engaging in conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt;
 - e. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA by causing a telephone to ring and engaging Plaintiff in telephone conversations repeatedly and continuously with the intent to annoy, abuse or harass; and
 - f. Defendant violated §1692g of the FDCPA by failing to send

written notification, within five (5) days after its initial communication with Plaintiff, advising Plaintiff of her rights to dispute the debt or request verification of the debt.

29. As a direct and proximate result of one or more or all of the statutory violations above, Plaintiff has suffered emotional distress.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, JEAN SCHRADER, respectfully requests judgment be entered against Defendant, NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., for the following:

- a. Declaratory judgment that Defendant's conduct violated the Fair
 Debt Collection Practices Act,
- b. Statutory damages pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection Practices

 Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692k,
- c. Actual damages,
- d. Costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692k
- e. Any other relief that this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

25

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, JEAN SCHRADER, demands a

jury trial in this case.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

DATED: |2 30 | 11 KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

By: /s/cm19Thor KIMMel

Craig Thor Kimmel

(CTK-31054)

Attorney ID # 57100

Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002

Phone: (215) 540-8888

Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com